

R E M A R K S

Prior to entry of this Amendment:

- Claims 15, 18, and 26-35 were pending in the present application
- Claims 15, 18, and 26-35 stand rejected

Upon entry of this Amendment, which is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth below:

- Claims 15, 18, 26-32, and 34-42 will be pending (18 claims)
- Claims 15, 18, and 35-37 will be the only independent claims (5 independent claims)
- Claims 15 and 18 will be amended
- Claims 36-42 will be added
- Claim 33 will be cancelled

Telephone Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the helpful telephone conversation held on September 25, 2003, with Applicants' representative. The Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed the present application in light of the Pugsley reference.

Applicants' representative suggested that Pugsley does not teach or suggest a feature generally directed to a credit card number for use in place of an account number that identifies a credit card account, as generally recited in independent Claim 35. The Examiner did not agree.

While no formal agreement was reached, Applicants are grateful for the opportunity to discuss the present application with the Examiner.

Claim Amendments

1. Claim 33 has been cancelled without prejudice

Claim 33 has been cancelled without prejudice by this Amendment.

2. Claims 15 and 18 have been amended

Each of Claims 15 and 18 has been amended to recite a feature of *wherein the processing unit is in communication with a central credit card processing system maintained by a credit card issuer*, as previously recited in now-cancelled Claim 33.

Claim 18 has also been amended to recite features of *transmitting the second account identifier to a central credit card processing system maintained by a credit card issuer for verification thereof and receiving information from the central credit card processing system regarding authorization of a transaction based on said verification* (emphasis added).

Claim 15 has been amended to recite *a transmitting/receiving device operable to (i) transmit the second account identifier to a central credit card processing system maintained by a*

credit card issuer for verification thereof and (ii) receive information from the credit card processing system regarding authorization of the second account identifier (emphasis added). A minor typographical error in Claim 15 was also corrected.

Claims 15 and 18 are believed to contain allowable subject matter as discussed herein.

3. New Claims 36-42 have been added

New claims 36-42 have been added by this Amendment and are discussed further herein. New Claims 36 and 37 are independent. Claims 38-42 depend from new Claim 37. No new matter has been added.

Section 102(b) Rejection

Claims 15, 18, and 26-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,629,874 issued to Pugsley et al. ("Pugsley"). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's Section 102(b) rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of any of Claims 15, 18, and 26-35.

Claim 33 has been cancelled without prejudice.

1. Embodiments of the present invention

In some embodiments of the present invention, a cardholder wishing to purchase goods or services (e.g., in person, via telephone or via the Internet) transmits a single-use number to a merchant, and the merchant enters the single-use number into a terminal (e.g., an authorization terminal, a computer terminal) connected to a central credit card processing system maintained by a credit card issuer. The number is sent to the credit card processing system for authorization. The central system processor maps the single-use credit card number onto a conventional credit card account and determines whether the transaction is authorized. If so, the central system returns an authorization code for display on the merchant's authorization terminal. If not, the central system transmits an authorization failed message. [See, e.g., Specification, page 13, lines 11-25].

A single-use credit card number is one example of a second account identifier that is used only one time in place of a first account identifier (e.g., an unchanging "true" account number or account identifier). [See, e.g., Specification, page 13, lines 27-32, page 14, lines 6-18].

2. Pugsley

Pugsley "relates to a prepayment metering system for services such as electricity, gas and water." [Column 1, lines 5-6]. Security in the Pugsley system depends on a card and a coded sequence of numbers. The card is inserted into a terminal, which reads a first number A stored previously on the card. A new number A' is derived from the first number A, and the number A' is stored on the card in place of the number A. [Column 3, lines 15-32].

The consumer inserts the card into a meter, where the new number A' is read. From A', the meter derives a number (e.g., using decryption of A'). This number is compared to a stored number (e.g., A) that the meter received from the card at the time of the last insertion of the card into the meter. If the two numbers coincide, and if the meter number on the card matches the meter number stored in the meter, the meter is credited and the new number A' is stored at the meter. In this way, the meter is prepared for the next alteration of the number A when the card is next inserted at the terminal station. [Column 3, lines 37-66].

According to Pugsley, therefore, a number (e.g., A, A') received by a card from a terminal station may be communicated to a meter. That same number may also be transmitted from the card back to the terminal station (e.g., in order to generate a new number).

There is no suggestion of the card receiving any information from the meter: "The card..., when inserted by the customer, is not modified by the meter. Once it has been read, it merely activates the meter to allow consumption of the unit amount of electricity paid for." [Column 4, lines 5-9].

Also, there is no suggestion in Pugsley of the described meter transmitting any of the coded sequence of numbers to the described terminal station. The meter is described as being at the consumer's premises. [Column 4, lines 46-47].

3. Independent Claim 35

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 35 is not anticipated by Pugsley. Pugsley does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent Claim 35.

3.1. Pugsley does not disclose receiving a product identifier that identifies a product, in which the product is associated with a transaction

Claim 35 recites a feature of *receiving a product identifier that identifies a product, in which the product is associated with a transaction*. Pugsley does not teach or suggest such a feature.

The Examiner does not assert otherwise and in fact does not address this limitation at all.

Pugsley does not suggest the desirability of such a feature. For example, Pugsley is directed to a prepayment metering system using a card that may be used at a specified utility meter: "Once it has been read, it merely activates the meter to allow consumption of the unit amount of electricity paid for." [Column 4, lines 7-9]. Accordingly, there is no suggestion of a need to identify a product.

3.2. Pugsley does not disclose receiving a credit card number from a customer as payment for a transaction, in which the credit card number is for use only one time, and in which the credit card number is for use in place of an account number that identifies a credit card account

Claim 35 recites a feature of *receiving a credit card number from a customer as payment for a transaction, in which the credit card number is for use only one time, and in which the*

credit card number is for use in place of an account number that identifies a credit card account. Pugsley does not teach or suggest such a feature.

For example, Pugsley does not suggest *an account number that identifies a credit card account*. The Examiner asserts that “resulting number A” is for use in place of “number recorded on the card, A.” [Office Action, page 2]. However, there is nothing in Pugsley suggesting that “A” is *an account number that identifies* an account, much less *that identifies a credit card account*.

Further, the Examiner does not provide any reasoning in support of such an interpretation of Pugsley. In fact, each of the described numbers “A” and “A” is merely one number in the required “coded sequence of numbers.” [See, e.g., Column 4, lines 11-17 (“the terminal must read the old card to know what number A was left in the meter the last time the card was used so that it can generate the appropriate new number A' to put on the card.”)]. There is nothing in Pugsley suggesting that any number of this “coded sequence of numbers ” identifies *a credit card account*.

Pugsley does describe use of a meter number corresponding to a meter. However, Pugsley does not describe use of another identifier in place of the meter number, nor does Pugsley suggest that the meter number is for use in place of an account identifier. Applicants respectfully submit that the described meter does not suggest *a credit card account*.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Pugsley is devoid of a hint or suggestion of *a credit card number for use in place of an account number that identifies a credit card account*, as recited in independent Claim 35.

In contrast, various embodiments of the present invention provide for wherein a credit card number may be used only one time to perform a transaction, in place of a credit card account number (e.g., an unchanging identifier which is stored in a database maintained by a credit card issuer). [See, e.g., Specification, page 13, lines 27-32].

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of Claim 35. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the Section 102(b) rejection of Claim 35.

4. Claim 30

Applicants respectfully submit that contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Pugsley does not teach or suggest *wherein the transaction comprises a transaction conducted over at least one of the Internet and the telephone*. The Examiner refers to the Abstract, FIGs. 1 and 2, Column 1, lines 28-56, and Column 2 lines 30-54 as teaching this feature. Applicants respectfully submit that the reference, including the cited portions, is devoid of any hint of the Internet or a telephone, much less *conducting a transaction over the Internet or over a telephone*.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of Claim 30. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the Section 102(b) rejection of Claim 30.

5. Claim 34

Applicants respectfully submit that contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Pugsley does not teach or suggest *wherein the second account identifier comprises a sixteen-digit identifier*. The Examiner refers to the Abstract, FIGs. 1 and 2, Column 1, lines 28-56, and Column 2 lines 30-54 as teaching this feature. Applicants respectfully submit that the reference, including the cited portions, is devoid of any hint of *a sixteen-digit identifier*.

According to some embodiments of the present invention, a second account identifier comprising a sixteen-digit identifier may be advantageous as it may be used as a conventional credit card number. [See, e.g., Specification, page 13, lines 7-9]. Pugsley is devoid of any hint of the desirability of using any of the "coded sequence of numbers" as a conventional credit card number.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of Claim 34. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the Section 102(b) rejection of Claim 34.

6. Independent Claims 15 and 18

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 15 and 18 are not anticipated by Pugsley. Pugsley does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent Claim 15 and 18.

6.1. Pugsley does not disclose a second account identifier specific to a transaction and for use in place of a first account identifier

Each of Claims 15 and 18 generally recites a feature of *a second account identifier specific to a transaction and for use in place of a first account identifier*. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Pugsley does not teach or suggest such a feature.

For example, as discussed above, Pugsley is devoid of a hint or suggestion that either of the described numbers "A" and "A'" identifies an account. The Examiner does not provide any reasoning as to why one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have interpreted the "coded sequence of numbers" of Pugsley as suggesting *an account identifier*.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Pugsley is devoid of a hint or suggestion of *a second account identifier specific to a transaction and for use in place of a first account identifier*, as generally recited in each of independent Claims 15 and 18.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of Claims 15 and 18.

6.2. Pugsley does not disclose transmitting the second account identifier to a central credit card processing system maintained by a credit card issuer for verification thereof or receiving information from the central credit card processing system regarding authorization of a transaction based on said verification

Claim 18 now recites features of *transmitting the second account identifier to a central credit card processing system maintained by a credit card issuer for verification thereof and*

receiving information from the central credit card processing system regarding authorization of a transaction based on said verification (emphasis added). Pugsley does not teach or suggest such features.

The Examiner refers Applicants to the Abstract and FIGs. 1 and 2 of Pugsley as teaching a processing unit in communication with a central credit card processing system maintained by a credit card issuer. [Office Action, page 4].

However, Pugsley does not suggest transmitting an account identifier to a central entity (e.g., a central credit card processing system) for verification and receiving from that same central entity information regarding authorization of a transaction based on the verification, as generally recited in Claim 18. The Examiner does not assert that Pugsley teaches any such feature. For example, as discussed above, the meter of the Pugsley does not communicate any numbers to the terminal station or to the card.

In contrast, as discussed herein, various embodiments of the present invention allow for an entity (e.g., a merchant, a terminal) to receive a second account identifier that is specific to a transaction for use in place of a first account identifier (e.g., an unchanging account number), to transmit that second account identifier to a central credit card processing system maintained by a credit card issuer for authorization (e.g., of a purchase), and to receive information regarding authorization of the second account identifier and / or the transaction. [See, e.g., Specification, page 14, lines 14-19].

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Pugsley is devoid of a hint or suggestion of the features of transmitting the second account identifier to a central credit card processing system maintained by a credit card issuer for verification thereof and receiving information from the central credit card processing system regarding authorization of a transaction based on said verification, as now recited in Claim 18 (emphasis added).

Applicants also respectfully submit that Pugsley is devoid of a hint or suggestion of a transmitting/receiving device operable to (i) transmit the second account identifier to a central credit card processing system maintained by a credit card issuer for verification thereof and (ii) receive information from the credit card processing system regarding authorization of the second account identifier, as now recited in Claim 15 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the Section 102(b) rejection of Claims 15 and 18 (and Claims 26-32 and 34 dependent from Claim 18).

Newly-Added Claims 36-42 Are Patentable Over Pugsley

Newly-added Claims 36-42 are patentable over Pugsley and the other references of record.

1. Claim 36**1.1. Pugsley does not disclose receiving a product identifier that identifies a product, in which the product is associated with a transaction**

New independent Claim 36 recites a feature of *receiving a product identifier that identifies a product, in which the product is associated with a transaction*. As discussed above with respect to Claim 35, Pugsley does not teach or suggest such a feature and the Examiner has not addressed this limitation in the present Office Action.

1.2. Pugsley does not disclose receiving a single-use credit card number from a cardholder, in which the credit card number is for use only one time, and in which the single-use credit card number is for use in place of an account number that identifies a cardholder

As discussed above with respect to Claim 35, Pugsley does not teach or suggest *receiving a credit card number from a customer, in which the credit card number is for use in place of an account number that identifies a credit card account*.

Similarly, Pugsley does not teach or suggest *receiving a single-use credit card number from a cardholder, in which the single-use credit card number is for use in place of an account number that identifies a cardholder*, as recited in new Claim 36. As discussed above, some embodiments of the present invention provide for a credit card number that is for use only once in place of a “true” account number of a cardholder. Pugsley does not teach or suggest such a feature.

1.3. Pugsley does not disclose transmitting a single-use credit card number to a credit card issuer for authorization of a transaction after receiving the single-use credit card number from a cardholder

In contrast to various embodiments of the present invention, Pugsley does not suggest that a credit card number may be received from a cardholder by an entity (e.g., a merchant), and then also transmitted by that same entity to a credit card issuer for authorization of the transaction.

Neither, the meter, the card, nor the terminal station of Pugsley suggest such a feature. For example, as discussed above, the meter of Pugsley does not transmit any numbers it receives. The card of Pugsley does not receive a number from a cardholder, and the terminal station of Pugsley does not transmit a number for authorization after receiving that same number from a cardholder.

Further, there is no suggestion in Pugsley of the desirability of an entity performing the above step. As discussed above, Pugsley uses a card to carry a number from a terminal station to a meter. Accordingly, there is no suggestion that the meter receiving the number would transmit that number to a credit card issuer for authorization of a transaction—the meter performs its own authorization (e.g., by comparison with a previously-stored number).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Pugsley does not teach or suggest features generally directed to *transmitting a single-use credit card number to a credit card issuer for authorization of a transaction after receiving the single-use credit card number from a cardholder*, as recited in independent Claim 35.

2. Claim 37

Various embodiments of the present invention allow for a single-use credit card number to be entered at a merchant terminal, such as an authorization terminal. [See, e.g., Specification, page 13, lines 11-15]. Other types of terminals (e.g., computer terminals) and devices are known in the art. [See, e.g., Specification, page 2]. As discussed herein and in the Specification, a received single-use credit card number may then be transmitted to a credit card issuer for authorization of a purchase and / or verification of single-use credit card number. The credit card issuer may then provide information to the terminal indicating whether the purchase is authorized.

In contrast to various embodiments of the present invention, Pugsley does not suggest receiving a single-use credit card number at a terminal of a merchant and then also transmitting from the same terminal that same single-use number to a credit card issuer for authorization of a purchase, nor receiving at that same terminal information from a credit card issuer indicating whether the purchase is authorized.

For example, as discussed above, the meter of Pugsley does not transmit any numbers it receives. The card of Pugsley does not receive a number from a cardholder, and the terminal station of Pugsley does not transmit a number for authorization after receiving that same number from a cardholder.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Pugsley does not teach or suggest features generally directed to: *transmitting from a terminal of a merchant a single-use credit card number to a credit card issuer for authorization of a purchase after receiving the single-use credit card number at the same terminal and receiving at the same terminal information from the credit card issuer indicating whether the purchase is authorized*, as generally recited in independent Claim 37.

3. Claims 38-42

New Claims 38-42 depend from new Claim 37 and are believed to be independent for at least the reasons stated herein with respect to Claim 37.

Further with respect to Claims 38 and 39, Pugsley does not teach or suggest wherein a transaction is conducted over the Internet or via a telephone (as discussed above with respect to Claim 30). Pugsley also does not teach or suggest that *a single-use credit card number is*

received at a terminal of a merchant via the Internet or via a telephone, as generally recited in Claims 38 and 39, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 36-42 contain allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

It is submitted that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early re-examination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees that may be required for this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 50-0271. Furthermore, should an extension of time be required, please grant any extension of time which may be required to make this Amendment timely, and please charge any fee for such an extension to Deposit Account No. 50-0271.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment or the present application, the Examiner is cordially requested to contact Michael Downs at telephone number (203) 461-7292 or via electronic mail at mdowns@walkerdigital.com.


Petition for Extension of Time to Respond

Applicants hereby petition for a THREE-month extension of time with which to respond to the Office Action. Please charge \$475.00 for this petition to our Deposit Account No. 50-0271. Please charge any additional fees that may be required for this Response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0271.

If any additional extension of time is required, please grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this Response timely, and please charge any fee for such extension to Deposit Account No. 50-0271.

Respectfully submitted,

December 10, 2003
Date


Michael Downs
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 50,252
Walker Digital, LLC
mdowns@walkerdigital.com
(203) 461-7292 /voice
(203) 461-7300 /fax